

Date: Thu, 24 Feb 94 04:30:13 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #84
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 24 Feb 94 Volume 94 : Issue 84

Today's Topics:

 I WANT MY EXTRA CLASS PERMIT NOW (3 msgs)
 The *language* requirement!
 Two meter frequency allocations (4 msgs)
 woops

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 23 Feb 94 22:09:33 GMT
From: nprdc!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!chip.ucdavis.edu!
ez006683@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: I WANT MY EXTRA CLASS PERMIT NOW
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Answering your own posts? :-)

A great x ray technician! (xraytech@sugar.NeoSoft.COM) wrote:
: In article <064307Z23021994@anon.penet.fi>,
: Dan Pickersgill <an64930@anon.penet.fi> wrote:
: >I want my EXTRA class permit NOW! - I'm far too busy to work for it.
: >Don't you dare ask me to learn your CW, I'm far too important for that.
: >I've been waiting 3 years for you to change your rules to let me in, isn't
: >that long enough? Send it now and I'll stop whining to everybody.
: >Call me codeless in Ohio.

: It's not an Extra Class "permit," Dan. It's an Extra Class License.

: You've been waiting three years? WHAT have you been doing, since you
: obviously haven't been working on your upgrade. Ah...let me guess.
: You've been posting in rec.radio.amateur.policy. And whining.

: --

: Radiographers who are able to use a radiographic machine well are
: great assets to the health care facility in which they are employed.

: --Dianne C. DeVos, "Basic Principles of Radiographic Exposure"

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@KE6LW.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                      Internet: ddtodd@ucdavis.edu             *
*                      Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102            *
*                      Davis CA 95616                          *
*-----*
*   The only thing I can officially say for the University is:  *
*   What I say is in no way related to oficial University policy *
*-----*
```

Date: Wed, 23 Feb 1994 06:36:01 UTC
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!pipex!uknet!EU.net!
news.eunet.fi!anon.penet.fi@ames.arpa
Subject: I WANT MY EXTRA CLASS PERMIT NOW
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I want my EXTRA class permit NOW! - I'm far too busy to work for it.
Don't you dare ask me to learn your CW, I'm far too important for that.
I've been waiting 3 years for you to change your rules to let me in, isn't
that long enough? Send it now and I'll stop whining to everybody.
Call me codeless in Ohio.

To find out more about the anon service, send mail to help@anon.penet.fi.
Due to the double-blind, any mail replies to this message will be anonymized,
and an anonymous id will be allocated automatically. You have been warned.
Please report any problems, inappropriate use etc. to admin@anon.penet.fi.

Date: 23 Feb 1994 03:28:25 -0600
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!uuneo.NeoSoft.com!

sugar.NeoSoft.COM!not-for-mail@ames.arpa
Subject: I WANT MY EXTRA CLASS PERMIT NOW
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <064307Z23021994@anon.penet.fi>,
Dan Pickersgill <an64930@anon.penet.fi> wrote:
>I want my EXTRA class permit NOW! - I'm far too busy to work for it.
>Don't you dare ask me to learn your CW, I'm far too important for that.
>I've been waiting 3 years for you to change your rules to let me in, isn't
>that long enough? Send it now and I'll stop whining to everybody.
>Call me codeless in Ohio.

It's not an Extra Class "permit," Dan. It's an Extra Class License.

You've been waiting three years? WHAT have you been doing, since you obviously haven't been working on your upgrade. Ah...let me guess. You've been posting in rec.radio.amateur.policy. And whining.

--

Radiographers who are able to use a radiographic machine well are great assets to the health care facility in which they are employed.

--Dianne C. DeVos, "Basic Principles of Radiographic Exposure"

Date: 23 Feb 94 23:44:18 GMT
From: nprdc!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!eff!news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!
scorpion!jbromley@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: The *language* requirement!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CLMt8E.3xE@world.std.com>,
David R Tucker <drt@world.std.com> wrote:

>I've been thinking about the morse code requirement in the light of
>the discussion we've been having on language in this group, and I have
>an idea...

>I suggest we get rid of the code requirement - and substitute a
>*language* requirement!...

>There's no reason morse code couldn't be one of the "languages" (if
>you'll pardon the term) which people could master...

You'll get my vote in a nanosecond if you also include computer

languages on the approved list.

Date: 23 Feb 94 20:53:10 GMT
From: nprdc!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!wa4mei.ping.com!ke4zv!
gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Two meter frequency allocations
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <gdavis.762015940@griffin> gdavis@griffin.uvm.edu (Gary Davis) writes:

> Our University station is struggling with the student association for
> funding and as a result we put a 2 meter- cross band- remote base on
> the air. At the time it seemed as if an acceptable input frequency
> would be in the miscellaneous (uses) allocation. We put our input on
> 145.775 (an unused frequency in the area). Soon we we pounced on by
> the local coordinator who said we were in violation of part 97 since
> what we had was not a remote base, rather a repeater.

>

> I called ARRL legal counsel and he concluded that we did not have a
> repeater since we do the following:

>

> 1. turn it on and off when used

>

> 2. do-not operate or occupy the frequency 24 hours a day

>

> However, the local coordinator has said that any radio that uses any
> form of automatic T/R switching constitutes a repeater!

> Therefore, he contends we are in violation of part 97?

> In any event we change frequencies today, but are there any opinions
> on exactly what constitutes a repeater.

97.3(a)(35) Repeater. An amateur station that automatically retransmits the signals of other stations.

If its transmitter is not controlled on and off *for each transmission* by a control operator, but rather will go into transmit when it hears a signal from any other station on it's input frequency, it's a repeater. And repeaters can only be legally operated in a band segment where repeater operation is permitted. The local coordinator is correct.

There is no such thing as a "remote base" in the rules. There are remotely controlled stations. To qualify as a remotely controlled station, its transmitter PTT must be controlled *only* by a control operator using a station running in auxillary operation, above 222 MHz, or by wireline. Even if you designated everyone who uses it as a "control operator", you still can't use 2 meters as the control channel since auxillary operation isn't permitted there.

You *can* operate a cross band repeater *as long as both input and output frequencies are in band segments where repeater operation is permitted*. But you must comply with all the other repeater rules such as IDing, and having a means of positive control *not on the repeater input frequency*. (Yeah, most people's cross band operations *are* illegal.) And if you cause interference to a coordinated repeater, say by accidentally crosslinking two existing machines, *you* are primarily responsible for resolving the problem.

Gary

--

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--------------|--|--------------------------|
| Gary Coffman KE4ZV | | You make it, | | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary |
| Destructive Testing Systems | | we break it. | | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary |
| 534 Shannon Way | | Guaranteed! | | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary |
| Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | | | | |

Date: 24 Feb 94 00:31:22 GMT
From: world!dts@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Two meter frequency allocations
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <gdavis.762015940@griffin> gdavis@griffin.uvm.edu (Gary Davis) writes:

> Our University station is struggling with the student association for
> funding and as a result we put a 2 meter- cross band- remote base on
> the air. At the time it seemed as if an acceptable input frequency
> would be in the miscellaneous (uses) allocation. We put our input on
> 145.775 (an unused frequency in the area). Soon we we pounced on by

Where is your local area? By the way, the 145.51 to 145.80 part of the band plan is labeled "experimental use". While the band plan is a gentleman's agreement and not law, one should consider abiding by it. Remote bases are not really all that experimental.

> the local coordinator who said we were in violation of part 97 since
> what we had was not a remote base, rather a repeater.

You are operating under automatic control. Consider the station a repeater or under auxiliary control, but the requirements are the same.

>

> I called ARRL legal counsel and he concluded that we did not have a
> repeater since we do the following:

>

> 1. turn it on and off when used

I don't see anything in the rules that covers part time versus full time operation.

>

>2. do-not operate or occupy the frequency 24 hours a day

>

>However, the local coordinator has said that any radio that uses any form of automatic T/R switching constitutes a repeater!

>Therefore, he contends we are in violation of part 97?

>In any event we change frequencies today, but are there any opinions on exactly what constitutes a repeater.

You do in fact have a station under automatic control. I take it the device IDs properly every 10 minutes on 145.775 when active? Under automatic control it MUST ID.

You do have a way to control the device other than on 145.775, correct? It is necessary to have a secondary control capability, whether that be landline or RF on 220MHz or up.

>

>In my opinion, when the law was enacted, a repeater was construed to be a remote system with inputs/outputs in the same band and not a box which is turned on or off before and after use.

Nothing in the repeater rules limits the devices to dual frequencies on one band. Packet systems, simplex repeaters, and anything which you cannot directly reach out and touch are covered by the rules. All of these are special uses and are described by what's there.

>

>I cannot see how our occupancy of the frequency is much different from sporadic "simplex" operation.

>

>73-- Gary

>

>--

> ***** Gary E. Davis***** WQ1F *****

> The most common of all follies is to believe passionately in the

> palpably not true. It is the chief occupation of mankind.-H.L.Mencken

--

Daniel Senie
Daniel Senie Consulting
508-365-5352

Internet: dts@world.std.com
n1jeb@world.std.com
Compuserve: 74176,1347

Date: 24 Feb 94 00:37:32 GMT
From: nprdc!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
steve@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Two meter frequency allocations
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Gary Davis (gdavis@griffin.uvm.edu) wrote:
: Our University station is struggling with the student association for
: funding and as a result we put a 2 meter- cross band- remote base on
: the air. At the time it seemed as if an acceptable input frequency
: would be in the miscellaneous (uses) allocation. We put our input on
: 145.775 (an unused frequency in the area). Soon we we pounced on by
: the local coordinator who said we were in violation of part 97 since
: what we had was not a remote base, rather a repeater.

I'm a little confused as to how you have this set up. Are you going
in on say 440, and coming out on 2m? Or are you going in on 2m on
one freq, and coming out on another 2m freq, i.e is it in-band or
outa band.

One problem you do have is defining a remote base. There ain't no
such animal in the rules...so it is assumed to be allowed since
it isn't prohibited. I guess an acceptable common definition might
be an ancillary(as opposed to auxiliary ;-) transceiver providing
access to another band that can be switched on and off. Is this
what you have? Again....what are the frequencies involved here?.

Another simple point is that the "coordinator" doesn't have any
more clue about the rules than the rest of us ;-) His statement is
simply his opinion and doesn't carry any more weight than an OO
or your nearest ham radio neighbor. Now if the FCC says otherwise...
then you got problems ;-) So whatever you do..don't ask them!

Steve KA6S

Date: Wed, 23 Feb 1994 15:05:40 GMT
From: emba-news.uvm.edu!griffin!gdavis@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Two meter frequency allocations
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Our University station is struggling with the student association for
funding and as a result we put a 2 meter- cross band- remote base on
the air. At the time it seemed as if an acceptable input frequency
would be in the miscellaneous (uses) allocation. We put our input on

145.775 (an unused frequency in the area). Soon we we pounced on by the local coordinator who said we were in violation of part 97 since what we had was not a remote base, rather a repeater.

I called ARRL legal counsel and he concluded that we did not have a repeater since we do the following:

1. turn it on and off when used
2. do-not operate or occupy the frequency 24 hours a day

However, the local coordinator has said that any radio that uses any form of automatic T/R switching constitutes a repeater! Therefore, he contends we are in violation of part 97? In any event we change frequencies today, but are there any opinions on exactly what constitutes a repeater.

In my opinion, when the law was enacted, a repeater was construed to be a remote system with inputs/outputs in the same band and not a box which is turned on or off before and after use.

I cannot see how our occupancy of the frequency is much different from sporadic "simplex" operation.

73-- Gary

--

***** Gary E. Davis***** WQ1F *****

The most common of all follies is to believe passionately in the palpably not true. It is the chief occupation of mankind.-H.L.Mencken

Date: 23 Feb 94 22:09:51 GMT
From: nprdc!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!gerald@cc.utexas.edu!
astro.as.utexas.edu!oo7@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: woops
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Please 'scuse the posting about 5B4ADA, it was supposed to go to r.r.a.misc. Also please excuse my now having to post this, apologizing for the previous post, thus having to apologize for two posts. Let me guess - you guys are still debating whether the code test is a good idea. Well, back to it!

Derek "used to read this group" Wills (AA5BT, G3NMX)
Department of Astronomy, University of Texas,
Austin TX 78712. (512-471-1392)

oo7@astro.as.utexas.edu

Date: 24 Feb 94 06:14:24 GMT
From: nprdc!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!gatech!swrinde!
menudo.uh.edu!uuneo.NeoSoft.com!sugar.NeoSoft.COM!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <064307Z23021994@anon.penet.fi>, <2kf7jp\$q6t@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,
<CLp6vz.EF6@ucdavis.edu>inde
Subject : Re: I WANT MY EXTRA CLASS PERMIT NOW

In article <CLp6vz.EF6@ucdavis.edu>,
Daniel D. Todd <ez006683@chip.ucdavis.edu> wrote:
>
>Answering your own posts? :-)

Not hardly.

--
Radiographers who are able to use a radiographic machine well are
great assets to the health care facility in which they are employed.

--Dianne C. DeVos, "Basic Principles of Radiographic Exposure"

Date: 23 Feb 94 13:21:15 GMT
From: nprdc!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!eff!news.kei.com!ub!newserve!sarah!rpi!
psinntp!psinntp!arrl.org!ehare@network.ucsd.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CLIBD6.JFG@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <kNo3Hc1w165w@mystis.wariat.org>,
<CLM3rJ.FH5@news.Hawaii.Edu>.eng
Subject : Re: Exams are Trivial?

Jeff Herman (jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu) wrote:

: In article <kNo3Hc1w165w@mystis.wariat.org> dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan
Pickersgill) writes:

: >But Jeff, there are many reasons for Amateur Radio to exist besides the
: >tech portion (aside from the fact that that area interests me greatly).
: >Why do you diminish the value of those areas of the Service?

: Dan: I don't mean to sound like I am diminishing the value of the

: dozens of other areas of our wonderful hobby. But the common back-
: round - that area that is supposed to tie us together - is the
: technical area. From that we branch out and have fun in our chosen
: niche. But whatever that niche is, whether it's moonbounce, public
: service, DX, TV, whatever - it will depend in part on our technical
: knowledge.

This may sound strange from someone working in the ARRL Technical Department, but I don't believe that there is any one area, technical or operating, that MUST be part of a ham's interests. There are those who get their licenses just to be able to operate their favorite modes. There are those who get their licenses just so they can put the transmitter on the air after they build it. Insofar as the law allows such conduct, I think it is okay for a ham to love or hate the technical aspects of ham radio, or love or hate any operating (or other) aspect of ham radio.

I do agree that the technical aspect of the service is an important one, and as hams we can and should encourage each other's technical growth. But encouragement means just that -- to even imply that if someone is not technical, they are not a real ham, is going quite a bit past "encouragement."

: I've purposely picked this branch of our hobby because I've read
: on here statements such as 'Why do I need to know the technical
: matters if I only want to work in public service?'

Why do I need to know anything about operating? I only want to put a carrier on the air and ID to actually test the transmitter I just built? (This question was raised only to make a point.) In reality, amateur testing covers operating and technical areas, because any one of us can explore any aspect of ham radio.

: Well, no one in their right mind would want to fool around with the
: internals of a modern handheld, but the two things that we DO have control
: over, and we should be well-schooled in, is the power source
: and the antenna.

Well, there are lots of people not in their right mind in ham radio! :-). I can buy a power source; I can buy an antenna; I can buy the radio; I can buy the microphone. Then, I can pay someone to install them in my home and car and just operate. And, if the FCC hears about it, they won't take my license. :-).

I have offered my personal comments on this issue not to try to say that you are wrong, because I personally feel that the technical aspects of the service ARE quite important. I just don't agree that hams MUST pursue them. And I think that hams who don't pursue the technical

dream are just a good a ham as I am, better in some cases! After all, I check into our local traffic net about once every three years. I have never ran across an auto accident and reported it over my local repeater. I stayed indoors during the last hurricane. There are hams who claim that you MUST be involved with public service or you are not really into ham radio.

Put yourself into the shoes of someone with zero technical interest, and even less ability. How would you feel about the statement that the technical aspects of ham radio are the MOST important? If it were true, would that not diminish you and your accomplishments. If you were not technical, would you be more likely to learn some technical things from someone who held them up as the only worthwhile goal of Amateur Radio, or from someone who just demonstrated enthusiasm for things technical.

Either way, enjoy your version of ham radio. As I heard Jim Kearman say, it is a thousand hobbies rolled into one!

73 from ARRL HQ, Ed
--

Ed Hare, KA1CV ehare@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #84

